



Steve Taylor
2211 West Mulberry St., #100
Fort Collins, CO 80521
staylor@dauntlessbus.com
970-224-2865

21 May 08

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
Attn: Jonathan G. Sterrett
(Examiner; phone: 971-272-6881, 8-6)

Re.: Response to Office Action Summary

App. No.: 10/626987	Art Unit: 3623	Inventor: Stephen Taylor
Filing date: 25 July 03	OAS mail date: 12 Dec 07	Reply by date: 12 June 08

Dear Mr. Sterrett,

I received your Office Action Summary (for App. No. 10/626987) which stated (under disposition of claims) that claims 1-23 are pending and rejected. Thank you for your review of my patent application.

Under your review, regarding independent claim 1, this claim was rejected because its steps would not provide for a "concrete" result. Per page 3, second paragraph (of the OAS), the reason for not being concrete was that "estimations would vary based on the person providing the estimate".

Additional rejections were listed involving more tactical matters of my proposed invention and prior art (citing Donath). Although I believe these concerns could be addressed by revision of my application, I submit that the key issue at hand is the rejection of claim 1 for not being "concrete" (for the reason stated above).

Because my invention deals with *strategic* operations of a business, one of its objectives is to teach company management to unify and focus their strategic operations so as to limit "personal opinions" and arrive at an operational consensus regarding company strategy. My thesis was that by implementing my invention, arriving at such a consensus could be systematically possible because the tactical realities of market forces and the boundaries of technology limitations would limit the statistical variation of "personal opinions" to such a degree so as to negligible.

It is my understanding of your review that this "thesis" of mine is categorically incorrect. Stated otherwise, your thesis is that no amount of market realities or technology boundaries will overcome the inherent diversity of human opinion as it applies to operating a business.

Although I could modify my invention so as to focus on tactical matters (and thus find a means to address the claims rejections), such a change would go against the original "spirit" of the invention – i.e. a strategic level system designed to teach corporate management to work with business and technological limitations (and enhance their business accordingly) rather than act on personal whim. As this attribute lies at the heart of my proposed invention, working to correct other deficiencies of my application would not be worth the effort (until this issue is successfully resolved).

Therefore, in conclusion, as it is my understanding that maintaining such a "spirit" will, by the premises of your review, result in a rejection of claims 1 – 23 of my application, I hereby abandon my application.

If there is any attribute of my evaluation presented in this letter that you believe is incorrect and thus could result in my patent application proceeding forward, please notify me. If not, I will assume my abandonment will be upheld.

Regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Steve Taylor', with a stylized, flowing script.

Steve Taylor